

Gradient Estimates for the Perfect Conductivity Problem

Ellen Shiting Bao

YanYan Li *

Biao Yin

Department of Mathematics

Rutgers University

110 Frelinghuysen Rd.

Piscataway, NJ 08854

0 Introduction

Let Ω be a bounded open set in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with $C^{2,\alpha}$ boundary, $n \geq 2$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, D_1 and D_2 be two bounded strictly convex open subsets in Ω with $C^{2,\alpha}$ boundaries which are ε apart and far away from $\partial\Omega$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{D_1}, \overline{D_2} \subset \Omega, \quad \text{the principal curvature of } \partial D_1, \partial D_2 \geq \kappa_0 \\ \varepsilon := \text{dist}(D_1, D_2) > 0, \quad \text{dist}(D_1 \cup D_2, \partial\Omega) > r_0, \quad \text{diam}(\Omega) < \frac{1}{r_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (0.1)$$

where $\kappa_0, r_0 > 0$ are universal constants independent of ε .

We denote

$$\tilde{\Omega} := \Omega \setminus \overline{D_1 \cup D_2}.$$

Given $\varphi \in C^2(\partial\Omega)$, consider the following scalar equation with Dirichlet boundary condition:

$$\begin{cases} \text{div}(a_k(x)\nabla u_k) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_k = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (0.2)$$

where

$$a_k(x) = \begin{cases} k \in (0, \infty) & \text{in } D_1 \cup D_2, \\ 1 & \text{on } \Omega \setminus \overline{D_1 \cup D_2}. \end{cases} \quad (0.3)$$

*Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0401118.

It is well known that there exists a unique solution $u_k \in H^1(\Omega)$ of the above equation, which is also the minimizer of I_k on $H_\varphi^1(\Omega)$, where

$$H_\varphi^1(\Omega) := \{u \in H^1(\Omega) \mid u = \varphi \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}, \quad I_k[v] := \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega a_k |\nabla v|^2.$$

As explained in the introduction of [9], the above equation in dimension $n = 2$ can be used as a simple model in the study of composite media with closely spaced interfacial boundaries. For this purpose, the domain Ω would model the cross-section of a fiber-reinforced composite, D_1 and D_2 would represent the cross-sections of the fibers, $\tilde{\Omega}$ would represent the matrix surrounding the fibers, and the shear modulus of the fibers would be k and that of the matrix would be 1. Equation (0.2) is then obtained by using a standard model of anti-plane shear, and the solution u_k represents the out of plane elastic displacement. The most important quantities from an engineering point of view are the stresses, in this case represented by ∇u_k .

It is well known that the solution u_k satisfies $\|u_k\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(D_i)} < \infty$. In fact, if ∂D_1 and ∂D_2 are $C^{m,\alpha}$, we have $\|u_k\|_{C^{m,\alpha}(D_i)} < \infty$. Such results do not require D_i to be convex and hold for general elliptic systems with piecewise smooth coefficients; see e.g. theorem 9.1 in [9] and proposition 1.6 in [8]. For a fixed $0 < k < \infty$, the $C^{m,\alpha}(D_i)$ -norm of the solution might tend to infinity as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Babuska, Anderson, Smith and Levin [4] were interested in linear elliptic systems of elasticity arising from the study of composite material. They observed numerically that, for solution u to certain homogeneous isotropic linear systems of elasticity, $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}$ is bounded independently of the distance ε between D_1 and D_2 . Bonnetier and Vogelius [5] proved this in dimension $n = 2$ for the solution u_k of (0.2) when D_1 and D_2 are two unit balls touching at a point. This result was extended by Li and Vogelius in [9] to general second order elliptic equations with piecewise smooth coefficients, where stronger $C^{1,\beta}$ estimates were established. The $C^{1,\beta}$ estimates were further extended by Li and Nirenberg in [8] to general second order elliptic systems including systems of elasticity. For higher derivative estimates, e.g. an ε -independent L^∞ -estimate of second derivatives of u_k in D_1 , we draw attention of readers to the open problem on page 894 of [8]. In [9] and [8], the ellipticity constants are assumed to be away from 0 and ∞ . If we allow ellipticity constants to deteriorate, the situation is different. It has been shown in various papers, see e.g. [6] and [10], that when $k = \infty$ the L^∞ -norm of ∇u_k for the solution u_k of equation (0.2) generally becomes unbounded as ε tends to zero. The rate at which the L^∞ norm of the gradient of a special solution has been shown in [6] to be $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$.

In this paper, we consider the perfect conductivity problem, where $k = +\infty$. It was proved by Ammari, Kang and Lim in [3] and Ammari, Kang, H. Lee, J. Lee and Lim in [2] that, when D_1 and D_2 are balls of comparable radii embedded in $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^2$, the blow-up rate of the gradient of the solution to the perfect conductivity problem is $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$ as ε goes to zero; with the lower bound given in [3] and the upper bound given in [2]. Yun in [11] generalized the above mentioned result in [3] by establishing the same lower bound, $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$, for two strictly convex subdomains in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

In this paper, we give both lower and upper bounds to blow-up rate of the gradient for the solution to the perfect conductivity problem in a bounded matrix, where two strictly convex subdomains are embedded. Our methods apply to dimension $n \geq 3$ as well. One might reasonably suspect that the blow-up rate in dimension $n \geq 3$ should be smaller than that in dimension $n = 2$. However we prove the opposite: As ε goes to zero, the blow-up rate is $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$, $(\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|)^{-1}$ and ε^{-1} for $n = 2, 3$ and $n \geq 4$, respectively. We also give a criteria, in terms of a linear functional of the boundary data φ , for the situation where the rate of blow-up is realized. Note that [3] and [2] contain also results for $k < \infty$.

The perfect conductivity problem is described as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}, \\ u|_+ = u|_- & \text{on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2, \\ \nabla u \equiv 0 & \text{in } D_1 \cup D_2, \\ \int_{\partial D_i} \frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} \Big|_+ = 0 & (i = 1, 2), \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial \Omega. \end{cases} \quad (0.4)$$

where

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \nu} \Big|_+ := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{u(x + t\nu) - u(x)}{t}.$$

Here and throughout this paper ν is the outward unit normal to the domain and the subscript $\pm$ indicates the limit from outside and inside the domain, respectively.

The existence and uniqueness of solutions to equation (0.4) are well known, see the Appendix. Moreover, the solution $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ is the weak limit of the solutions u_k to equations (0.2) as $k \rightarrow +\infty$. It can be also described as the unique function which has the “least energy” in appropriate functional space, defined as $I_\infty[u] = \min_{v \in \mathcal{A}} I_\infty[v]$, where

$$I_\infty[v] := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla v|^2, \quad v \in \mathcal{A},$$

$$\mathcal{A} := \{v \in H_\varphi^1(\Omega) \mid \nabla v \equiv 0 \text{ in } D_1 \cup D_2\}.$$

The readers can refer to the Appendix for the proofs of the above statements.

We now state more precisely what it means by saying that the boundary of a domain, say Ω , is $C^{2,\alpha}$ for $0 < \alpha < 1$: In a neighborhood of every point of $\partial\Omega$, $\partial\Omega$ is the graph of some $C^{2,\alpha}$ functions of $n - 1$ variables. We define the $C^{2,\alpha}$ norm of $\partial\Omega$, denoted as $\|\partial\Omega\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}$, as the smallest positive number $\frac{1}{a}$ such that in the $2a$ -neighborhood of every point of $\partial\Omega$, identified as 0 after a possible translation and rotation of the coordinates so that $x_n = 0$ is the tangent to $\partial\Omega$ at 0, $\partial\Omega$ is given by the graph of a $C^{2,\alpha}$ function, denoted as f , which is defined as $|x'| < a$, the a -neighborhood of 0 in the tangent plane. Moreover, $\|f\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(|x'| < a)} \leq \frac{1}{a}$.

Theorem 0.1 *Let $\Omega, D_1, D_2 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, ε be defined as in (0.1), $\varphi \in C^2(\partial\Omega)$. Let $u \in H^1(\Omega) \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ be the solution to equation (0.4). For ε sufficiently small, there is a positive constant C which depends only on $n, \kappa_0, r_0, \|\partial\Omega\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}, \|\partial D_1\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}$ and $\|\partial D_2\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}$, but independent of ε such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} &\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)} && \text{for } n = 2, \\ \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|} \|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)} && \text{for } n = 3, \\ \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} \|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)} && \text{for } n \geq 4. \end{aligned} \quad (0.5)$$

Remark 0.1 *We draw attention of readers to the independent work of Yun [12] where he has also established the upper bound, $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$, in $\mathbb{R}^2$. The methods are very different. Results in this paper and those in [11] and [12] do not really need D_1 and D_2 to be strictly convex, the strict convexity is only needed for the portions in a fixed neighborhood (the size of the neighborhood is independent of ε) of a pair of points on ∂D_1 and ∂D_2 which realize minimal distance ε . In fact, our proofs of Theorem 0.1–0.2 also apply, with minor modification, to more general situations where two inclusions, D_1 and D_2 , are not necessarily convex near points on the boundaries where minimal distance ε is realized; see discussions after the proofs of Theorem 0.1–0.2 in Section 1.3.*

To prove Theorem 0.1, we first decompose the solution u of equation (0.4) as follows:

$$u = C_1 v_1 + C_2 v_2 + v_3 \quad (0.6)$$

where $C_i := C_i(\varepsilon)$ ($i = 1, 2$) be the boundary value of u on ∂D_i ($i = 1, 2$) respectively, and $v_i \in C^2(\tilde{\Omega})$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v_1 = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}, \\ v_1 = 1 & \text{on } \partial D_1, \quad v_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial D_2 \cup \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (0.7)$$

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v_2 = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}, \\ v_2 = 1 & \text{on } \partial D_2, \quad v_2 = 0 & \text{on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (0.8)$$

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v_3 = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}, \\ v_3 = 0 & \text{on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2, \quad v_3 = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (0.9)$$

Define

$$Q_\varepsilon[\varphi] := \int_{\partial D_1} \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial \nu} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial \nu} - \int_{\partial D_2} \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial \nu} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu}, \quad (0.10)$$

then $Q_\varepsilon : C^2(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a linear functional.

Theorem 0.2 *With the same conditions in Theorem 0.1, let $u \in H^1(\Omega) \cap C^1(\bar{\Omega})$ be the solution to equation (0.4). For ε sufficiently small, there exists a positive constant C which depends on $n, \kappa_0, r_0, \|\partial\Omega\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}, \|\partial D_1\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}, \|\partial D_2\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}$ and $\|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)}$, but is independent of ε such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} &\geq \frac{|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]|}{C} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}} & \text{for } n = 2, \\ \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} &\geq \frac{|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]|}{C} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|} & \text{for } n = 3, \\ \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} &\geq \frac{|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]|}{C} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon} & \text{for } n \geq 4. \end{aligned} \quad (0.11)$$

Remark 0.2 *If $\varphi \equiv 0$, then the solution to equation (0.4) is $u \equiv 0$. Theorem 0.1 and Theorem 0.2 are obvious in this case. So we only need to prove them for $\|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)} = 1$, by considering $u/\|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)}$.*

Remark 0.3 *It is interesting to know when $|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]| \geq \frac{1}{C}$ for some positive constant C independent of ε . Roughly speaking $Q_\varepsilon[\varphi] \rightarrow Q^*[\varphi]$ as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and this amounts to $Q^*[\varphi] \neq 0$. For details, see Section 2.*

Theorem 0.1–0.2 can be extended to equations with more general coefficients as follows: Let $n, \Omega, D_1, D_2, \varepsilon$ and φ be same as in Theorem 0.1, and let

$$A_2(x) := (a_2^{ij}(x)) \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$$

be $n \times n$ symmetric matrix functions in $\tilde{\Omega}$ satisfying for some constants $0 < \lambda \leq \Lambda < \infty$,

$$\lambda|\xi|^2 \leq a_2^{ij}(x)\xi_i\xi_j \leq \Lambda|\xi|^2, \quad \forall x \in \tilde{\Omega}, \quad \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

and $a_2^{ij}(x) \in C^2(\overline{\Omega \setminus \omega})$.

We consider

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \right) = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}, \\ u|_+ = u|_- & \text{on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2, \\ \nabla u = 0 & \text{in } D_1 \cup D_2, \\ \int_{\partial D_i} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \nu_j|_+ = 0 & (i = 1, 2), \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (0.12)$$

where repeated indices denote as usual summations.

Here is an extension of Theorem 0.1:

Theorem 0.3 *With the above assumptions, let $u \in H^1(\Omega) \cap C^1(\widetilde{\Omega})$ be the solution to equation (0.12). For ε sufficient small, there is a positive constant C which depends only on $n, \kappa_0, r_0, \|\partial\Omega\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}, \|\partial D_1\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}, \|\partial D_2\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}, \lambda, \Lambda$ and $\|A_2\|_{C^2(\overline{\Omega})}$, but independent of ε such that estimate (0.5) holds.*

Similar to the decomposition formula (0.6), we decompose the solution u of equation (0.12) as follows:

$$u = C_1 V_1 + C_2 V_2 + V_3 \quad (0.13)$$

where $C_i := C_i(\varepsilon)$ ($i = 1, 2$) be the boundary value of u on ∂D_i ($i = 1, 2$) respectively, and $V_i \in C^2(\widetilde{\Omega})$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_1 \right) = 0 & \text{in } \widetilde{\Omega}, \\ V_1 = 1 \text{ on } \partial D_1, \quad V_1 = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_2 \cup \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (0.14)$$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_2 \right) = 0 & \text{in } \widetilde{\Omega}, \\ V_2 = 1 \text{ on } \partial D_2, \quad V_2 = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (0.15)$$

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_3 \right) = 0 & \text{in } \widetilde{\Omega}, \\ V_3 = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2, \quad V_3 = \varphi \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (0.16)$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\varepsilon[\varphi] := & \int_{\partial D_1} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_3 \nu_j \int_{\partial\Omega} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_2 \nu_j \\ & - \int_{\partial D_2} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_3 \nu_j \int_{\partial\Omega} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_1 \nu_j, \end{aligned} \quad (0.17)$$

then $Q_\varepsilon : C^2(\partial\Omega) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a linear functional.

Theorem 0.4 *With the same conditions in Theorem 0.3, let $u \in H^1(\Omega) \cap C^1(\widetilde{\Omega})$ be the solution to equation (0.12). For ε sufficiently small and $Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]$ defined by (0.17), there is a positive constant C which depends only on $n, \kappa_0, r_0, \|\partial D_1\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}, \|\partial D_2\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}, \lambda, \Lambda$ and $\|A_2\|_{C^2(\overline{\Omega})}$, but independent of ε such that estimate (0.11) holds.*

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 1 we prove Theorem 0.1–0.2. In Section 2 we give a criteria for $|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]|$ to be bounded below by a positive constant independent of ε . Theorem 0.3–0.4 are proved in Section 3. In the Appendix we present some elementary results for the conductivity problem.

1 Proof of Theorem 0.1 and 0.2

In the introduction, we write $u = C_1 v_1 + C_2 v_2 + v_3$ as in (0.6). To prove our main theorems, we first estimate $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})}$ in terms of $|C_1 - C_2|$, and then estimate $|C_1 - C_2|$.

In this section we use, unless otherwise stated, C to denote various positive constants whose values may change from line to line and which depend only on $n, \kappa_0, r_0, \|\partial\Omega\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}, \|\partial D_1\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}$ and $\|\partial D_2\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}$.

Proposition 1.1 *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 0.1, let u be the solution of equation (0.4). There exists a positive constants C , such that, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon} |C_1 - C_2| \leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} |C_1 - C_2| + C\|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)}. \quad (1.18)$$

To prove this proposition, we first estimate the gradients of v_1, v_2 and v_3 . Without loss of generality, we may assume throughout the proof of the proposition that $\|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)} = 1$; see Remark 0.2.

Lemma 1.1 *Let v_1, v_2 be defined by equations (0.7) and (0.8), then for $n \geq 2$, we have*

$$\|\nabla v_1\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\nabla v_2\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon}, \quad \left\| \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \right\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} + \left\| \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial \nu} \right\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} \leq C.$$

Proof: By the maximum principle, $\|v_1\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq 1$, and since v_1 achieves constants on each connected component of $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$, and each connected component of $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$ is $C^{2,\alpha}$ then the gradient estimates for harmonic functions implies that

$$\|\nabla v_1\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq \frac{C\|v_1\|_{L^\infty}}{\text{dist}(\partial D_1, \partial D_2)} = \frac{C}{\varepsilon}.$$

Similarly, we can prove $\|\nabla v_2\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C/\varepsilon$. The second inequality follows from the boundary estimates for harmonic functions. $\square$

Before estimating $|\nabla v_3|$, we first prove:

Lemma 1.2 *Let $\rho \in C^2(\tilde{\Omega})$ be the solution to:*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \rho = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}, \\ \rho = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2, & \rho = 1 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (1.19)$$

Then $\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C$.

Proof: Let $\rho_i (i = 1, 2) \in C^2(\Omega \setminus \overline{D_i}) \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega \setminus D_i})$ be the solution to:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \rho_i = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{D_i}, \\ \rho_i = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_i, & \rho_i = 1 \text{ on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

Again by the maximum principle and the strong maximum principle, we obtain $0 < \rho_1 < 1$ in $\Omega \setminus \overline{D}_1$. Since $\overline{D}_2 \subset \Omega \setminus \overline{D}_1$, we have $\rho_1 > 0 = \rho$ on ∂D_2 . And since $\rho_1 = \rho$ on ∂D_1 and $\partial \Omega$, therefore $\rho_1 > \rho$ on $\tilde{\Omega}$. Now because $\rho_1 = \rho = 0$ on ∂D_1 and $\rho_1 > \rho > 0$ on $\tilde{\Omega}$, so

$$\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_1)} \leq \|\nabla \rho_1\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_1)} \leq C.$$

Similarly,

$$\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_2)} \leq \|\nabla \rho_2\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_2)} \leq C.$$

By the boundary estimate of harmonic functions, we know that $\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty(\partial \Omega)} \leq C$. Since $\Delta \rho = 0$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$, $\partial_{x_i} \rho$ is also harmonic, by the maximum principle,

$$\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq \max \left(\|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_1)}, \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_2)}, \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty(\partial \Omega)} \right) \leq C.$$

□

Now, we estimate $|\nabla v_3|$:

Lemma 1.3 *Let v_3 be defined by equation (0.9), for $n \geq 2$, we have*

$$\|\nabla v_3\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C.$$

Proof: Since $v_3 = -\rho = \rho = 0$ on $\partial D_i (i = 1, 2)$, and $-\rho \leq v_3 = \varphi \leq \rho$ on $\partial \Omega$, we have, by the maximum principle,

$$-\rho \leq v_3 \leq \rho \quad \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}.$$

It follows, for $i = 1, 2$, that

$$\|\nabla v_3\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_i)} \leq \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_i)} \leq C.$$

By the boundary estimate,

$$\|\nabla v_3\|_{L^\infty(\partial \Omega)} \leq C.$$

By the harmonicity of $\partial_{x_i} v_3$ and the maximum principle,

$$\|\nabla v_3\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C.$$

□

Remark 1.1 *Without assuming $\|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial \Omega)} = 1$, we have*

$$\|\nabla v_3\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2)} \leq C \|\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\partial \Omega)},$$

where C has the dependence specified at the beginning of this section, except that it does not depend on $\|\partial \Omega\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}$. This is easy to see from the proof of Lemma 1.3.

The above lemma yields the main result of [1].

Corollary 1.1 ([1]) *Let B_1 and B_2 be two spheres with radius R and centered at $(\pm R \pm \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, 0, \dots, 0)$, respectively. Let H be a harmonic function in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Define u to be the solution to*

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_1 \cup B_2}, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_1 \cup \partial B_2, \\ u(x) - H(x) = O(|x|^{-1}) & \text{as } |x| \rightarrow +\infty. \end{cases}$$

Then there is a constant C independent of ε such that

$$\|\nabla(u - H)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \overline{B_1 \cup B_2})} \leq C.$$

Proof: By the maximum principle and interior estimates of harmonic functions, the C^3 norm of $u|_{B_{2R}(0)}$ is bounded by a constant independent of ε . Apply Lemma 1.3 with $\Omega = B_{2R}(0)$ and $\varphi = u|_{B_{2R}(0)}$, we immediately obtain the above corollary. $\square$

With the above lemmas, we give the

Proof of Proposition 1.1: Since $u = C_1$ on ∂D_1 , $u = C_2$ on ∂D_2 , $\text{dist}(\partial D_1, \partial D_2) = \varepsilon$, by the mean value theorem, $\exists \xi \in \tilde{\Omega}$ such that

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \geq |\nabla u(\xi)| \geq \frac{|C_1 - C_2|}{\varepsilon}.$$

By the decomposition formula (0.6),

$$\nabla u = C_1 \nabla v_1 + C_2 \nabla v_2 + \nabla v_3 = (C_1 - C_2) \nabla v_1 + C_2 \nabla(v_1 + v_2) + \nabla v_3.$$

Hence,

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq |C_1 - C_2| \|\nabla v_1\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} + |C_2| \|\nabla(v_1 + v_2)\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} + \|\nabla v_3\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})}.$$

By Lemma 1.2, since $v_1 + v_2 = 1 - \rho$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$, we have

$$\|\nabla(v_1 + v_2)\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} = \|\nabla(1 - \rho)\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} = \|\nabla \rho\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq C.$$

Using the fact we showed in the Appendix, $\|u\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \leq C$, so $|C_1| + |C_2| \leq C$.

Therefore using also Lemma 1.1 we obtain,

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon} |C_1 - C_2| + C.$$

This proof is now completed. $\square$

Later we will give an estimate of $|C_1 - C_2|$, which, together with Proposition 1.1, yields the lower and upper bounds of $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})}$ for strictly convex subdomains D_1 and D_2 .

1.1 Estimate of $|C_1 - C_2|$

Back to the decomposition formula (0.6), denote

$$a_{ij} = \int_{\partial D_i} \frac{\partial v_j}{\partial \nu} \quad (i, j = 1, 2), \quad b_i = \int_{\partial D_i} \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial \nu} \quad (i = 1, 2). \quad (1.20)$$

We first give some basic lemmas:

Lemma 1.4 *Let a_{ij} and b_i be defined as in (1.20), then they satisfy the following:*

1. $a_{12} = a_{21} > 0$, $a_{11} < 0$, $a_{22} < 0$,
2. $-C \leq a_{11} + a_{21} \leq -\frac{1}{C}$, $-C \leq a_{22} + a_{12} \leq -\frac{1}{C}$,
3. $|b_1| \leq C$, $|b_2| \leq C$.

By the fourth line of equation (0.4), C_1 and C_2 satisfy

$$\begin{cases} a_{11}C_1 + a_{12}C_2 + b_1 = 0, \\ a_{21}C_1 + a_{22}C_2 + b_2 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1.21)$$

By solving the above linear system, using $a_{12} = a_{21}$ and $a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}a_{21} > 0$ which follows from Lemma 1.4, we obtain

$$C_1 = \frac{-b_1a_{22} + b_2a_{12}}{a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}^2}, \quad C_2 = \frac{-b_2a_{11} + b_1a_{12}}{a_{11}a_{22} - a_{12}^2}, \quad (1.22)$$

and therefore,

$$|C_1 - C_2| = \frac{|b_1 - \alpha b_2|}{|a_{11} - \alpha a_{12}|}, \quad \text{where } \alpha = \frac{a_{11} + a_{12}}{a_{22} + a_{12}} > 0. \quad (1.23)$$

Based on this formula, we will give the estimates for $|a_{11} - \alpha a_{12}|$ and $|b_1 - \alpha b_2|$, then the estimate for $|C_1 - C_2|$ follows immediately.

Proof of Lemma 1.4: (1) By the maximum principle and the strong maximum principle,

$$0 < v_1 < 1 \quad \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}.$$

By the Hopf Lemma, we know that

$$\frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial D_1} < 0, \quad \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial D_2} > 0, \quad \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial \Omega} < 0.$$

Similarly,

$$\frac{\partial v_2}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial D_1} > 0, \quad \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial D_2} < 0, \quad \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial \nu} \Big|_{\partial \Omega} < 0.$$

Thus $a_{11} < 0$, $a_{12} > 0$, $a_{21} > 0$ and $a_{22} < 0$.

Also, since v_1 and v_2 are the solutions of equations (0.7) and equations (0.8), respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \Delta v_1 \cdot v_2 - \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \Delta v_2 \cdot v_1 = - \int_{\partial D_2} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \cdot 1 + \int_{\partial D_1} \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial \nu} \cdot 1 \\ &= -a_{21} + a_{12}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.24)$$

i.e. $a_{21} = a_{12}$.

(2) We will prove the first inequality, the second one stands with the same reason. By the harmonicity of v_1 in $\tilde{\Omega}$,

$$a_{11} + a_{21} = - \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \Delta v_1 + \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} = \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} < 0.$$

By Lemma 1.1,

$$a_{11} + a_{21} = \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \geq -C.$$

On the other hand, since $0 < v_1 < 1$ in $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $v_1 = 1$ on ∂D_1 , by the boundary gradient estimates of a harmonic function, $\exists B(\bar{x}, 2\bar{r}) \subset \tilde{\Omega}$, such that $v_1 > 1/2$ in $B(\bar{x}, \bar{r})$, where $\bar{r}$ is independent of ε . Let $\rho \in C^2(\Omega \setminus \overline{D_2 \cup B(\bar{x}, \bar{r})}) \cup C^1(\partial \Omega \cup \partial D_2 \cup \partial B(\bar{x}, \bar{r}))$ be the solution of the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta \rho = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{D_2 \cup B(\bar{x}, \bar{r})}, \\ \rho = 1/2 \text{ on } \partial B(\bar{x}, \bar{r}) & \rho = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_2 \cup \partial \Omega. \end{cases}$$

By the maximum principle and the strong maximum principle, $0 < \rho < 1/2$ in $\Omega \setminus \overline{D_2 \cup B(\bar{x}, \bar{r})}$. A contradiction argument based on the Hopf Lemma yields,

$$-\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \nu} \geq \frac{1}{C} \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega.$$

On the other hand, since $\rho \leq v_1$ on the boundary of $\Omega \setminus \overline{D_1 \cup D_2 \cup B(\bar{x}, \bar{r})}$, we obtain, via the maximum principle, $0 < \rho \leq v_1$ in $\Omega \setminus \overline{D_1 \cup D_2 \cup B(\bar{x}, \bar{r})}$. It follows, using $\rho = v_1 = 0$ on $\partial \Omega$, that

$$\frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \leq \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \nu} \quad \text{on } \partial \Omega.$$

Thus,

$$a_{11} + a_{21} = \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \leq \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \nu} \leq -\frac{1}{C}.$$

(3) Clearly,

$$0 = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \Delta v_1 \cdot v_3 - \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \Delta v_3 \cdot v_1 = \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \cdot \varphi + \int_{\partial D_1} \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial \nu} \cdot 1 = \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \cdot \varphi + b_1.$$

Thus,

$$|b_1| = \left| \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \cdot \varphi \right| \leq \int_{\partial\Omega} \left| \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \right| \leq C.$$

Thus, we finished the proof. $\square$

1.2 Estimate of $|a_{11} - \alpha a_{12}|$

By a translation and rotation of the axis, we may assume without loss of generality that D_1, D_2 are two strictly convex subdomains in $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ which satisfy the following:

$$(-\varepsilon/2, 0') \in \partial D_1, (\varepsilon/2, 0') \in \partial D_2, \varepsilon = \text{dist}(\partial D_1, \partial D_2) = \text{dist}(D_1, D_2). \quad (1.25)$$

Near the origin, we can find a ball $B(0, r)$ such that the portion of ∂D_i ($i = 1, 2$) in $B(0, r)$ is strictly convex, where $r > 0$ is independent of ε . Then $\partial D_1 \cap B(0, r)$ and $\partial D_2 \cap B(0, r)$ can be represented by the graph of $x_1 = f(x') - \varepsilon/2$ and $x_1 = g(x') + \varepsilon/2$ respectively, where $x' = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$. Thus $f(0') = g(0') = 0$, $\nabla f(0') = \nabla g(0') = 0$, and $-CI \leq (D^2 f(0')) \leq -\frac{1}{C}I$, $\frac{1}{C}I \leq (D^2 g(0')) \leq CI$.

With these notations, we first estimate a_{ii} for $i = 1, 2$.

Lemma 1.5 *Let a_{ii} be defined by (1.20), then*

$$\frac{1}{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \leq -a_{ii} \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}, \quad \text{for } n = 2, i = 1, 2.$$

Proof: It suffices to prove it for a_{11} . By the harmonicity of v_1 , we have

$$0 = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \Delta v_1 \cdot v_1 = - \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla v_1|^2 - \int_{\partial D_1} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} = - \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla v_1|^2 - a_{11},$$

i.e.

$$a_{11} = - \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla v_1|^2.$$

Now we construct a function (here in $\mathbb{R}^2$, we let $x = x_1, y = x_2$)

$$\overline{w}(x, y) = - \frac{x - g(y) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}{g(y) - f(y) + \varepsilon} \quad (1.26)$$

on $O_r := \tilde{\Omega} \cap \{(x, y) \mid |y| < r\}$. It is clear that $\overline{w}(x, y)$ is linear in x for fixed y and

$$\overline{w}|_{B(0, r) \cap \partial D_1} = 1; \quad \overline{w}|_{B(0, r) \cap \partial D_2} = 0,$$

so we have

$$\int_{f(y) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{g(y) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} |\partial_x \overline{w}(x, y)|^2 dx \leq \int_{f(y) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{g(y) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} |\partial_x v_1(x, y)|^2 dx,$$

i.e.

$$\frac{1}{g(y) - f(y) + \varepsilon} \leq \int_{f(y) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{g(y) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} |\partial_x v_1(x, y)|^2 dx.$$

Integrating on y we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{r/2} \int_{f(y) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{g(y) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} |\partial_x v_1(x, y)|^2 dx dy &\geq \int_0^{r/2} \frac{1}{g(y) - f(y) + \varepsilon} dy \\ &\geq \frac{1}{C} \int_0^{r/2} \frac{1}{y^2 + \varepsilon} dy = \frac{1}{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.27)$$

Thus

$$-a_{11} \geq \int_0^{r/2} \int_{f(y) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{g(y) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} |\partial_x v_1(x, y)|^2 dx dy \geq \frac{1}{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}}.$$

On the other hand, we can find $\psi \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &= 0 \text{ on } \overline{O}_{r/8}, \quad \psi = 1 \text{ on } \partial D_1 \setminus (\overline{O}_{r/4}), \quad \psi = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_2 \setminus (\overline{O}_{r/4}), \\ \psi &= 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\nabla \psi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq C. \end{aligned}$$

We can also find $\rho \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$0 \leq \rho \leq 1, \quad \rho = 1 \text{ on } \overline{O}_{r/2}, \quad \rho = 0 \text{ on } \overline{\Omega} \setminus O_r \text{ and } |\nabla \rho| \leq C.$$

Let $w = \rho\overline{w} + (1 - \rho)\psi$, then $w = 1 = v_1$ on ∂D_1 ; $w = 0 = v_1$ on ∂D_2 ; $w = 0 = v_1$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $w = \overline{w}$ on $\overline{O}_{r/2}$. Then by the properties of ψ , ρ and the harmonicity of v_1 , we have

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla v_1|^2 \leq \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla w|^2 \leq \int_{\tilde{\Omega} \cap O_{r/2}} |\nabla \overline{w}|^2 + C. \quad (1.28)$$

A calculation gives

$$\partial_y \overline{w} = \frac{g'(y)(g(y) - f(y) + \varepsilon) - (g(y) - x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})(g'(y) - f'(y))}{(g(y) - f(y) + \varepsilon)^2}.$$

We will show $\int_{\tilde{\Omega} \cap O_{r/2}} |\partial_y \overline{w}|^2 \leq C$.

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{r/2} \int_{f(y) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{g(y) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} |\partial_y \overline{w}(x, y)|^2 dx dy \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^{r/2} \int_{f(y) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{g(y) + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \left(\frac{g'(y)^2}{(g(y) - f(y) + \varepsilon)^2} + \frac{(g(y) - x + \frac{\varepsilon}{2})^2 (g'(y) - f'(y))^2}{(g(y) - f(y) + \varepsilon)^4} \right) dx dy \\ &= 2 \int_0^{r/2} \frac{g'(y)^2}{g(y) - f(y) + \varepsilon} dy + 2 \int_0^{r/2} \frac{(g'(y) - f'(y))^2}{g(y) - f(y) + \varepsilon} dy \\ &\leq C \int_0^{r/2} \frac{y^2}{y^2 + \varepsilon} dy + C \int_0^{r/2} \frac{y^2}{y^2 + \varepsilon} dy \\ &\leq C. \end{aligned} \quad (1.29)$$

Then by (1.28) and (1.29)

$$\begin{aligned}
|a_{11}| &= \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla v_1|^2 \leq \int_{\tilde{\Omega} \cap O_{r/2}} |\nabla \bar{w}|^2 + C \\
&\leq C \int_0^{r/2} \int_{f(y)-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{g(y)+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} |D_x \bar{w}(x, y)|^2 dx dy + C \\
&= C \int_0^{r/2} \frac{1}{g(y) - f(y) + \varepsilon} dy + C \leq C \int_0^{r/2} \frac{1}{y^2 + \varepsilon} dy + C \\
&\leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.30}$$

The proof is completed. $\square$

Similarly, we have

Lemma 1.6 *Let a_{ii} be defined by (1.20),*

$$\frac{1}{C} |\ln \varepsilon| \leq -a_{ii} \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|, \quad \text{for } n = 3, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Proof: We consider

$$\bar{w}(x_1, x') = -\frac{x - g(x') - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}{g(x') - f(x') + \varepsilon} \tag{1.31}$$

on $O_{r/2} := \tilde{\Omega} \cap \{(x_1, x') \mid |x'| < \frac{r}{2}\}$. Use the same proof in Lemma 1.5, we have

$$\int_0^{r/2} \int_{f(x')-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{g(x')+\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} |\partial_{x'} \bar{w}(x_1, x')|^2 dx_1 dx' \leq C.$$

Therefore, it suffices to verify that

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega} \cap O_{r/2}} |\partial_{x_1} \bar{w}(x_1, x')|^2 \sim |\ln \varepsilon|.$$

Indeed,

$$\int_{\tilde{\Omega} \cap O_{r/2}} |\partial_{x_1} \bar{w}(x_1, x')|^2 = \int_{|x'| < r/2} \frac{1}{g(x') - f(x') + \varepsilon} dx' \sim \int_0^{r/2} \frac{t}{Ct^2 + \varepsilon} dt \sim |\ln \varepsilon|.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 1.7 *Let a_{ii} be defined by (1.20),*

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq -a_{ii} \leq C \quad \text{for } n \geq 4, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

Proof: We only need

$$\int_{O_{r/2}} |\partial_{x_1} \bar{w}(x_1, x')|^2 = \int_{|x'| < r/2} \frac{1}{g(x') - f(x') + \varepsilon} dx' \sim \int_0^{r/2} \frac{t^{n-2}}{Ct^2 + \varepsilon} dt \sim C.$$

The proof is completed. $\square$

Lemma 1.8 *Let α be defined by (1.23), we have*

$$\frac{1}{C} \leq \alpha \leq C.$$

Proof: By the definition of α and using the second statement in Lemma 1.4, we are done. $\square$

To summarize, we have

Proposition 1.2 *Let a_{ij} and α be defined by (1.20) and (1.23), we have*

1. $\frac{1}{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \leq |a_{11} - \alpha a_{12}| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}$ for $n = 2$,
2. $\frac{1}{C} |\ln \varepsilon| \leq |a_{11} - \alpha a_{12}| \leq C |\ln \varepsilon|$ for $n = 3$,
3. $\frac{1}{C} \leq |a_{11} - \alpha a_{12}| \leq C$ for $n \geq 4$.

Proof: Since $a_{11} < 0$, $a_{12} > 0$, $a_{11} + a_{12} < 0$ and $\alpha > 0$, we have

$$|a_{11}| < |a_{11} - \alpha a_{12}| < (1 + \alpha) |a_{11}|.$$

Combining the results of Lemma 1.5, Lemma 1.6, Lemma 1.7 and Lemma 1.8, the proof is completed. $\square$

1.3 Estimate of $|b_1 - \alpha b_2|$

Proposition 1.3 *Let b_1 , b_2 , α and $Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]$ be defined by (1.20), (1.23) and (0.10), we have*

$$\frac{|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]|}{C} \leq |b_1 - \alpha b_2| \leq C \|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)}.$$

Proof: Combining the third result in Lemma 1.4 and Lemma 1.8, we have

$$|b_1 - \alpha b_2| \leq |b_1| + |\alpha| |b_2| \leq C \|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)}.$$

On the other hand, by the definition and the harmonicity of v_1 and v_2 and using Lemma 1.4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |b_1 - \alpha b_2| &= \frac{|b_1(a_{22} + a_{12}) - b_2(a_{11} + a_{12})|}{|a_{22} + a_{12}|} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{C} \cdot \left| \int_{\partial D_1} \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial \nu} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_2}{\partial \nu} - \int_{\partial D_2} \frac{\partial v_3}{\partial \nu} \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} \right| = \frac{|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]|}{C}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Now we are ready to prove our two main theorems:

Proof of Theorem 0.1-0.2: By Proposition 1.1 and (1.23), then using Proposition 1.2, 1.3, we are done. $\square$

As we mentioned in Remark 0.1, the strict convexity assumption of the two inclusions can be weakened. In fact, our proofs of Theorem 0.1–0.2 apply, with minor modification, to more general situations:

In $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, under the same assumptions in the beginning of Section 1.2 except for the strict convexity condition, $\partial D_1 \cap B(0, r)$ and $\partial D_2 \cap B(0, r)$ can be represented by the graph of $x_1 = f(x') - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ and $x_1 = g(x') + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, then $f(0') = g(0') = 0$, $\nabla(g - f)(0') = 0$. Assume further that

$$\lambda_0 |x'|^{2m} \leq g(x') - f(x') \leq \lambda_1 |x'|^{2m}, \quad \forall |x'| \leq r/2, \quad (1.32)$$

for some ε -independent $\lambda_0, \lambda_1 > 0, m \geq 1 \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Under the above assumption, let $u \in H^1(\Omega) \cap C^1(\widetilde{\Omega})$ be the solution to equation (0.4). For ε sufficiently small, there exist positive constants C and C' , such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]|}{C'} \cdot \varepsilon^{-\frac{n-1}{2m}} &\leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\widetilde{\Omega})} \leq C \|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)} \cdot \varepsilon^{-\frac{n-1}{2m}}, & \text{if } n-1 < 2m, \\ \frac{|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]|}{C'} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|} &\leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\widetilde{\Omega})} \leq C \|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|}, & \text{if } n-1 = 2m, \\ \frac{|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]|}{C'} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon} &\leq \|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\widetilde{\Omega})} \leq C \|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon}, & \text{if } n-1 > 2m, \end{aligned} \quad (1.33)$$

where $Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]$ is defined by (0.10), and C depends on $n, m, \lambda_0, \lambda_1, r_0, \|\partial\Omega\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}, \|\partial D_1\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}$ and $\|\partial D_2\|_{C^{2,\alpha}}$, C' depends on the same as C and also $\|\varphi\|_{C^2(\partial\Omega)}$, but both are independent of ε .

The proof is essentially the same except for the computation of $\int_{\widetilde{\Omega}} |\nabla v_1|^2$. In fact,

$$\int_0^{r/2} \int_{f(x') - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}}^{g(x') + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}} |\partial_{x'} \overline{w}(x_1, x')|^2 dx_1 dx' \leq C,$$

still holds. Then by (1.27) and (1.30) we only need to calculate

$$\int_{|x'| < r/2} \frac{1}{g(x') - f(x') + \varepsilon} dx' \sim \int_0^{r/2} \frac{\rho^{n-2}}{\rho^{2m} + \varepsilon} d\rho.$$

Indeed, if $n-1 < 2m$,

$$\int_0^{r/2} \frac{\rho^{n-2}}{\rho^{2m} + \varepsilon} d\rho = \varepsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2m}-1} \int_0^{r/2\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2m}}} \frac{s^{n-2}}{s^{2m} + 1} ds \sim C \varepsilon^{\frac{n-1}{2m}-1},$$

if $n - 1 = 2m$,

$$\int_0^{r/2} \frac{\rho^{n-2}}{\rho^{2m} + \varepsilon} d\rho = \frac{1}{2m} \int_0^{r/2} \frac{1}{\rho^{2m} + \varepsilon} d\rho^{2m} \sim C |\ln \varepsilon|,$$

if $n - 1 > 2m$,

$$\int_0^{r/2} \frac{\rho^{n-2}}{\rho^{2m} + \varepsilon} d\rho \sim C.$$

Therefore, we obtain (1.33) by using the same arguments in the proofs of Theorem 0.1 and Theorem 0.2.

Actually, we can replace $2m$ by any real number $\beta > 0$, the results still hold.

2 Estimate of $|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]|$

In order to identify situations when $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty}$ behaves exactly as the upper bound established in Theorem 0.1, we estimate in this section $|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]|$. To emphasize the dependence on ε , we denote D_1, D_2 by $D_{1\varepsilon}, D_{2\varepsilon}$, denote φ by φ_ε , and denote v_1, v_2, v_3 defined by equation (0.7), (0.8), (0.9) as $v_{1\varepsilon}, v_{2\varepsilon}, v_{3\varepsilon}$. In this section we assume, in addition to the hypotheses in Theorem 0.1, that along a sequence $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ (we still denote it as ε), $D_{1\varepsilon} \rightarrow D_1^*$, $D_{2\varepsilon} \rightarrow D_2^*$ in $C^{2,\alpha}$ norm, $\varphi_\varepsilon \rightarrow \varphi^*$ in $C^{1,\alpha}(\partial\Omega)$. We use notation $\tilde{\Omega}^* = \Omega \setminus \overline{D_1^* \cup D_2^*}$, and assume, without loss of generality, that $D_1^* \cap D_2^* = \{0\}$. We will show that as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, $v_{i\varepsilon}$ converges, in appropriate sense, to v_i^* which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v_1^* = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}^*, \\ v_1^* = 1 & \text{on } \partial D_1^* \setminus \{0\}, \quad v_1^* = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cup \partial D_2^* \setminus \{0\}, \end{cases} \quad (2.34)$$

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v_2^* = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}^*, \\ v_2^* = 1 & \text{on } \partial D_2^* \setminus \{0\}, \quad v_2^* = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \cup \partial D_1^* \setminus \{0\}, \end{cases} \quad (2.35)$$

$$\begin{cases} \Delta v_3^* = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}^*, \\ v_3^* = 0 & \text{on } \partial D_1^* \cup \partial D_2^*, \quad v_3^* = \varphi^* & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (2.36)$$

First we prove

Lemma 2.1 *There exist unique $v_i^* \in L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}^*) \cap C^0(\overline{\tilde{\Omega}^*} \setminus \{0\}) \cap C^2(\tilde{\Omega}^*)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, which solve equations (2.34), (2.35) and (2.36) respectively. Moreover, $v_i^* \in C^1(\overline{\tilde{\Omega}^*} \setminus \{0\})$.*

Proof: The existence of solutions to the above equations can easily be obtained by Perron's method, see theorem 2.12 and lemma 2.13 in [7]. For reader's convenience, we give below a simple proof of the uniqueness. We only need to prove that 0 is the only solution in $L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}^*) \cap C^0(\overline{\tilde{\Omega}^*} \setminus \{0\}) \cap C^2(\tilde{\Omega}^*)$ to the following equation:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta w = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}^*, \\ w = 0 & \text{on } \partial\tilde{\Omega}^* \setminus \{0\}. \end{cases} \quad (2.37)$$

Indeed, $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$|w(x)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^{n-2} \|w\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}^*)}}{|x|^{n-2}}, \quad \text{on } \partial(\tilde{\Omega}^* \setminus B_\varepsilon(0)).$$

By the maximum principle,

$$|w(x)| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^{n-2} \|w\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega}^*)}}{|x|^{n-2}}, \quad \forall x \in \tilde{\Omega}^* \setminus B_\varepsilon(0).$$

Thus $w \equiv 0$ in $\tilde{\Omega}^*$. The additional regularity $v_i^* \in C^1(\overline{\tilde{\Omega}^*} \setminus \{0\})$ follows from standard elliptic estimates and the regularity of the ∂D_i and $\partial \Omega$. $\square$

Lemma 2.2 *For $i = 1, 2, 3$,*

$$v_{i\varepsilon} \longrightarrow v_i^* \quad \text{in } C_{loc}^2(\tilde{\Omega}^*), \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.38)$$

$$\int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial v_{i\varepsilon}}{\partial \nu} \longrightarrow \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial v_i^*}{\partial \nu}, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad (2.39)$$

$$\int_{\partial D_{i\varepsilon}} \frac{\partial v_{3\varepsilon}}{\partial \nu} \longrightarrow \int_{\partial D_i^*} \frac{\partial v_3^*}{\partial \nu}, \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.40)$$

Proof: By the maximum principle, $\{\|v_{i\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty}\}$ is bounded by a constant independent of ε . By the uniqueness part of Lemma 2.1, we obtain (2.38) using standard elliptic estimates. By Lemma 1.3, $\{\|\nabla v_{3\varepsilon}\|_{L^\infty}\}$ is bounded by some constant independent of ε , so $\|\nabla v_3^*\|_{L^\infty} < \infty$. Estimate (2.39) and (2.40) follow from standard elliptic estimates. The proof is completed. $\square$

Similar to $Q_\varepsilon[\varphi_\varepsilon]$, we define

$$Q^*[\varphi^*] := \int_{\partial D_1^*} \frac{\partial v_3^*}{\partial \nu} \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial v_2^*}{\partial \nu} - \int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial v_3^*}{\partial \nu} \int_{\partial \Omega} \frac{\partial v_1^*}{\partial \nu}, \quad (2.41)$$

then $Q^* : C^2(\partial \Omega) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a linear functional. Let $Q_\varepsilon[\varphi_\varepsilon]$ and $Q^*[\varphi^*]$ be defined by equation (0.10), (2.41), then, by the above lemmas,

$$Q_\varepsilon[\varphi_\varepsilon] \longrightarrow Q^*[\varphi^*], \quad \text{as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Corollary 2.1 *If $\varphi^* \in C^2(\partial \Omega)$ satisfies $Q^*[\varphi^*] \neq 0$, then $|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi_\varepsilon]| \geq \frac{1}{C}$, for some positive constant C which is independent of ε .*

In the following we give some examples to show that, in general, the rates of the lower bounds established in Theorem 0.2 are optimal.

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be a bounded open set with $C^{2,\alpha}$ boundary, $0 < \alpha < 1$, which is symmetric with respect to x_1 -variable, i.e., $(x_1, x') \in \Omega$ if and only if $(-x_1, x') \in \Omega$, where $x' = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$.

Let D_1^* be a strictly convex bounded open set in $\{(x_1, x') \in \mathbb{R}^n | x_1 < 0\}$ with $C^{2,\alpha}$ boundary, $0 < \alpha < 1$, satisfying $0 \in \partial D_1^*$ and $\overline{D_1^*} \subset \Omega$. Set $D_2^* = \{(x_1, x') \in \mathbb{R}^n | (-x_1, x') \in D_1^*\}$.

Let $\varphi \in C^2(\partial\Omega) \setminus \{0\}$ satisfy

$$\varphi_{\text{odd}}(x_1, x') := \frac{1}{2}[\varphi(x_1, x') - \varphi(-x_1, x')] \leq 0 \text{ (or } \geq 0), \quad (2.42)$$

on $(\partial\Omega)^+ := \{(x_1, x') \in \partial\Omega | x_1 > 0\}$.

For $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, let

$$\begin{aligned} D_{1\varepsilon} &:= \{(x_1, x') \in \Omega | (x_1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, x') \in D_1^*\}, \\ D_{2\varepsilon} &:= \{(x_1, x') \in \Omega | (x_1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, x') \in D_2^*\}, \\ \varphi_\varepsilon &:= \varphi. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.1 *Under the above assumptions, we have $|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]| \geq \frac{1}{C}$, for some positive constant C independent of ε . Consequently,*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} &\geq \frac{1}{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}} && \text{for } n = 2, \\ \|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} &\geq \frac{1}{C\varepsilon|\ln \varepsilon|} && \text{for } n = 3, \\ \|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})} &\geq \frac{1}{C\varepsilon} && \text{for } n \geq 4, \end{aligned} \quad (2.43)$$

where u_ε is the solution to equation (0.4).

The above proposition can be easily obtained by the following lemma which gives a necessary and sufficient condition instead of condition (2.42) on φ for the lower bounds (2.43) to hold.

Let

$$(v_3^*)_{\text{odd}}(x_1, x') := \frac{1}{2}[v_3^*(x_1, x') - v_3^*(-x_1, x')], \quad (2.44)$$

we have

Lemma 2.3 *Under the same hypotheses in Proposition 2.1 except for the condition (2.42), let $Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]$ and $(v_3^*)_{\text{odd}}(x)$ be defined by equation (0.10) and (2.44), then the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *For some positive constant C independent of ε , we have $|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]| \geq \frac{1}{C}$,*
2. $\int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial(v_3^*)_{\text{odd}}}{\partial \nu} \neq 0.$

Proof: By symmetry, the strong maximum principle and the Hopf Lemma, we can easily obtain

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_1^*}{\partial \nu} = \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_2^*}{\partial \nu} < 0.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} Q^*[\varphi] &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_1^*}{\partial \nu} \left(\int_{\partial D_1^*} \frac{\partial v_3^*}{\partial \nu} - \int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial v_3^*}{\partial \nu} \right) \\ &= \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_1^*}{\partial \nu} \left(\int_{\partial D_1^*} \frac{\partial (v_3^*)_{\text{odd}}}{\partial \nu} - \int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial (v_3^*)_{\text{odd}}}{\partial \nu} \right) \\ &= -2 \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_1^*}{\partial \nu} \int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial (v_3^*)_{\text{odd}}}{\partial \nu}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $Q^*[\varphi] \neq 0$ if and only if $\int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial (v_3^*)_{\text{odd}}}{\partial \nu} \neq 0$. Then by Corollary 2.1, we complete the proof. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 2.1: Note that $(v_3^*)_{\text{odd}}(0, x') = 0$ by symmetry, and $(v_3^*)_{\text{odd}}$ is harmonic with $(v_3^*)_{\text{odd}} = \varphi_{\text{odd}} \leq 0$ (or ≥ 0) but not identically 0 on $(\partial\Omega)^+$. Now by using the strong maximum principle and the Hopf Lemma, it is clear that $\int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial (v_3^*)_{\text{odd}}}{\partial \nu} \neq 0$. Hence, by Lemma 2.3 and Theorem 0.2, we are done. $\square$

Remark 2.1 If $\varphi = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i x_i$ with $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b_1 \neq 0$, then by Proposition 2.1 we have $|Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]| \geq \frac{1}{C}$. Therefore, by Theorem 0.1 and 0.2, the blow-up rates of $\|\nabla u\|_{L^\infty(\tilde{\Omega})}$ are $\varepsilon^{-1/2}$ in dimension $n = 2$, $(\varepsilon |\ln \varepsilon|)^{-1}$ in dimension $n = 3$ and ε^{-1} in dimension $n \geq 4$.

Now instead of in a bounded set Ω , we consider in $\mathbb{R}^n$:

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u_\varepsilon = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D_{1\varepsilon} \cup D_{2\varepsilon}}, \\ u_\varepsilon|_+ = u_\varepsilon|_- & \text{on } \partial D_{1\varepsilon} \cup \partial D_{2\varepsilon}, \\ \nabla u_\varepsilon \equiv 0 & \text{in } D_{1\varepsilon} \cup D_{2\varepsilon}, \\ \int_{\partial D_{i\varepsilon}} \frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} \Big|_+ = 0 & (i = 1, 2), \\ \limsup_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} |x|^{n-1} |u_\varepsilon(x) - H(x)| < \infty, \end{cases} \quad (2.45)$$

where $H(x)$ is a given entire harmonic function in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

we have the following result regarding the lower bound for $|\nabla u_\varepsilon|$:

Proposition 2.2 *With the same assumptions on $D_{1\varepsilon}$ and $D_{2\varepsilon}$ as in Proposition 2.1, and let $H(x)$ be an entire harmonic function in $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying $H_{\text{odd}}(x_1, x') :=$*

$\frac{1}{2}[H(x_1, x') - H(-x_1, x')] < 0$ (or > 0) on $\mathbb{R}_+^n := \{(x_1, x') \in \mathbb{R}^n | x_1 > 0\}$, then for some positive constant C independent of ε , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D_{1\varepsilon} \cup D_{2\varepsilon}})} &\geq \frac{1}{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}} && \text{for } n = 2, \\ \|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D_{1\varepsilon} \cup D_{2\varepsilon}})} &\geq \frac{1}{C\varepsilon|\ln \varepsilon|} && \text{for } n = 3, \\ \|\nabla u_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D_{1\varepsilon} \cup D_{2\varepsilon}})} &\geq \frac{1}{C\varepsilon} && \text{for } n \geq 4, \end{aligned} \quad (2.46)$$

where u_ε is the solution to equation (2.45).

Proof: Step 1. First, we show that there exists a positive constant C independent of ε , such that for any small $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$|x|^{n-1}|u_\varepsilon(x) - H(x)| \leq C, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D_{1\varepsilon} \cup D_{2\varepsilon}}. \quad (2.47)$$

(i) For any bounded open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ with C^1 boundary ∂U satisfying $\partial U \cap \overline{D_{1\varepsilon} \cup D_{2\varepsilon}} = \emptyset$, we have, in view of the first and the fourth lines in (2.45),

$$\int_{\partial U} \frac{\partial u_\varepsilon}{\partial \nu} = \int_{U \setminus \overline{D_{1\varepsilon} \cup D_{2\varepsilon}}} \Delta u_\varepsilon = 0. \quad (2.48)$$

(ii) We show that there exists a positive constant M independent of ε , such that

$$\|u_\varepsilon - H\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D_{1\varepsilon} \cup D_{2\varepsilon}})} \leq M, \quad \forall \text{ small } \varepsilon > 0.$$

We only need to prove

$$\|u_\varepsilon - H\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \overline{D_{1\varepsilon} \cup D_{2\varepsilon}})} \leq \sum_{i=1}^2 (\max_{\overline{D_{i\varepsilon}}} H - \min_{\overline{D_{i\varepsilon}}} H). \quad (2.49)$$

Since $\nabla u_\varepsilon = 0$ in $D_{1\varepsilon} \cup D_{2\varepsilon}$, u_ε is constant on each $D_{i\varepsilon}$, denoted as $C_i(\varepsilon)$. We know that

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} (u_\varepsilon(x) - H(x)) = 0, \quad (2.50)$$

and

$$C_i(\varepsilon) - \max_{\overline{D_{i\varepsilon}}} H \leq u_\varepsilon - H \leq C_i(\varepsilon) - \min_{\overline{D_{i\varepsilon}}} H, \quad \text{on } D_{i\varepsilon}, \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (2.51)$$

If (2.49) did not hold, say,

$$\sup_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u_\varepsilon - H) > \sum_{i=1}^2 (\max_{\overline{D_{i\varepsilon}}} H - \min_{\overline{D_{i\varepsilon}}} H),$$

then, because of (2.50) and (2.51), there would exist $0 < a < \sup_{\mathbb{R}^n} (u_\varepsilon - H)$ such that $U := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid (u_\varepsilon - H)(x) > a\} \neq \emptyset$ satisfies $\partial U \cap \overline{D_{1\varepsilon} \cup D_{2\varepsilon}} = \emptyset$. We may assume,

by the Sard theorem, that a is a regular value of $u_\varepsilon - H$, and therefore ∂U is C^1 . By the Hopf lemma, $\frac{\partial(u_\varepsilon - H)}{\partial \nu} < 0$ on ∂U , and therefore

$$\int_{\partial U} \frac{\partial(u_\varepsilon - H)}{\partial \nu} < 0.$$

On the other hand, using (2.48) and the harmonicity of H in U , we have

$$\int_{\partial U} \frac{\partial(u_\varepsilon - H)}{\partial \nu} = - \int_{\partial U} \frac{\partial H}{\partial \nu} = - \int_U \Delta H = 0.$$

A contradiction.

(iii) Consider $w_\varepsilon(x) := u_\varepsilon(x) - H(x)$. Fix a constant $R_0 > 0$, independent of ε , such that $D_1^* \cup D_2^* \subset B_{R_0/2}(0)$, and let

$$\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(y) := \frac{1}{|y|^{n-2}} w_\varepsilon\left(\frac{y}{|y|^2}\right), \quad 0 < |y| < \frac{1}{R_0}.$$

Then $\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon$ is harmonic in $B_{1/R_0} \setminus \{0\}$. By the last line of (2.45), there exists a positive constant $C(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$|\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(y)| \leq C(\varepsilon)|y|, \quad 0 < |y| < \frac{1}{R_0}.$$

Therefore, $\Delta \widetilde{w}_\varepsilon = 0$ in B_{1/R_0} and $\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(0) = 0$. By (ii), we have $|\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon| \leq C$, on $\partial B_{1/R_0}$, for some positive constant C independent of ε . Hence, $|\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon| \leq C$, $|\nabla \widetilde{w}_\varepsilon| \leq C$ in $B_{1/(2R_0)}$, then

$$|\widetilde{w}_\varepsilon(y)| \leq C|y|, \quad |y| < \frac{1}{2R_0}.$$

Therefore, also using (ii), (2.47) holds.

Step 2. For $R > R_0$, let $\Omega = B_R(0)$. Let $\varphi_\varepsilon := u_\varepsilon|_{\partial\Omega}$, then by Corollary 2.1 and Theorem 0.2 it is enough to show, for some R , that $Q^*[\varphi^*] \neq 0$, where φ^* is defined at the beginning of this section. By symmetry, we have

$$Q^*[\varphi^*] = \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_1^*}{\partial \nu} \left(\int_{\partial D_1^*} \frac{\partial v_3^*}{\partial \nu} - \int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial v_3^*}{\partial \nu} \right).$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume $H_{\text{odd}}(x) > 0$ on $\mathbb{R}_+^n$. Recall that v_3^* is the solution of (2.36) with boundary data φ^* . In the following we use notation $(v_3^*)_h$ to denote the the solution of (2.36) with boundary data h . Since $Q^*[\varphi^*]$ is linear on φ^* and by symmetry $Q^*[H_{\text{even}}] = H[\varphi_{\text{even}}^*] = 0$, where $H_{\text{even}}(x) := H(x) - H_{\text{odd}}(x) = \frac{1}{2}[H(x_1, x') + H(-x_1, x')]$ and similar for φ_{even}^* , we may assume $H(x) = H_{\text{odd}}(x)$.

Now consider $w(x) = H(x) - (v_3^*)_H(x)$. Then $w(x)$ is harmonic in $\tilde{\Omega}^*$ which is defined at the beginning of this section. By symmetry, $w(-x_1, x') = -w(x_1, x')$, $w(x) = H(x)$ on $\partial D_1^* \cup \partial D_2^*$ and $w(x) = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. Therefore,

$$-2 \int_{\partial D_2^*} H \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}^*} w(x) \Delta w(x) + \int_{\tilde{\Omega}^*} |\nabla w|^2 = \int_{\tilde{\Omega}^*} |\nabla w|^2 \geq 0.$$

On the other hand, $(v_3^*)_H = 0$ on ∂D_2^* , $(v_3^*)_H > 0$ on $(\partial\Omega)^+$ and, by the oddness of $(v_3^*)_H$, $(v_3^*)_H = 0$ on $\{(x_1, x') \mid x_1 = 0\}$. Thus, by the maximum principle and the strong maximum principle, $(v_3^*)_H > 0$ in $\tilde{\Omega}^*$ and in turn, using the Hopf lemma, $\frac{\partial(v_3^*)_H}{\partial \nu} > 0$ on ∂D_2^* . Hence, using the harmonicity of H ,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\partial D_2^*} H \int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial(v_3^*)_H}{\partial \nu} &\geq \int_{\partial D_2^*} H \frac{\partial(v_3^*)_H}{\partial \nu} \geq \int_{\partial D_2^*} H \frac{\partial H}{\partial \nu} - \int_{\partial D_2^*} H \frac{\partial w}{\partial \nu} \\ &\geq \int_{D_2^*} |\nabla H|^2 \geq \frac{1}{C}, \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial(v_3^*)_H}{\partial \nu} \geq \frac{1}{C},$$

for positive constant C independent of R .

For $s_\varepsilon := \varphi_\varepsilon - H$ on $\partial\Omega$, by step 1, there exists a constant $C > 0$ which is independent of ε and R , such that $\|s_\varepsilon\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} \leq CR^{1-n}$. By Remark 1.1, we have $\|\nabla(v_3^*)_{s^*}\|_{L^\infty(\partial D_1^* \cup \partial D_2^*)} \leq C\|s^*\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)}$, thus,

$$\left| \int_{\partial D_i^*} \frac{\partial(v_3^*)_{s^*}}{\partial \nu} \right| \leq C \int_{\partial D_i^*} \|s^*\|_{L^\infty(\partial\Omega)} \leq CR^{1-n},$$

for some positive constant C independent of ε and R .

Therefore, for large enough R ,

$$\int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial(v_3^*)_{\varphi^*}}{\partial \nu} = \int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial(v_3^*)_H}{\partial \nu} + \int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial(v_3^*)_{s^*}}{\partial \nu} \geq \frac{1}{C} \neq 0.$$

It is also clear that $\int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_1^*}{\partial \nu} < 0$, Thus,

$$Q^*[\varphi^*] = -2 \int_{\partial\Omega} \frac{\partial v_1^*}{\partial \nu} \int_{\partial D_2^*} \frac{\partial(v_3^*)_{\varphi^*}}{\partial \nu} \neq 0.$$

This proof is completed. $\square$

Remark 2.2 In $\mathbb{R}^2$, when $D_{1\varepsilon}$ and $D_{2\varepsilon}$ are identical balls of radius 1, the estimate (2.46) was established in [2] under a weaker assumption $\partial_{x_1} H(0) \neq 0$.

3 Proof of Theorem 0.3 and 0.4

In the introduction, similar to the harmonic case, we still decompose $u = C_1 V_1 + C_2 V_2 + V_3$ as in (0.13).

Proposition 1.1 holds since Lemma 1.1–1.3 hold for V_1, V_2, V_3 defined by (0.14)–(0.16) and $\rho \in C^2(\tilde{\Omega})$ which is the solution to:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} \rho \right) = 0 & \text{in } \tilde{\Omega}, \\ \rho = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_1 \cup \partial D_2, \quad \rho = 1 \text{ on } \partial \Omega. \end{cases}$$

The proofs are essentially the same.

Now we start to estimate $|C_1 - C_2|$. By the decomposition formula (0.13), instead of (1.20), we denote

$$\begin{aligned} a_{lm} &= \int_{\partial D_l} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_m \nu_j \quad (l, m = 1, 2), \\ b_l &= \int_{\partial D_l} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_3 \nu_j \quad (l = 1, 2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

Then Lemma 1.4 and (1.21)–(1.23) still hold for a_{lm} and b_l defined above.

In fact, to prove Lemma 1.4 with general coefficients, we only need to change $\frac{\partial^*}{\partial \nu}$ to $a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i}^* \nu_j$, change Δ^* in $\partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i}^* \right)$ and change v_1, v_2, v_3 in V_1, V_2, V_3 , respectively, in the original proof of Lemma 1.4. For instance, (1.24) is changed to

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_1 \right) \cdot V_2 - \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_2 \right) \cdot V_1 \\ &= - \int_{\partial D_2} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_1 \nu_j \cdot 1 + \int_{\partial D_1} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_2 \nu_j \cdot 1 \\ &= -a_{21} + a_{12}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.53}$$

Therefore, to estimate $|C_1 - C_2|$, it is equivalent to estimating $|a_{11} - \alpha a_{12}|$ and $|b_1 - \alpha b_2|$.

For $|a_{11} - \alpha a_{12}|$, Lemma 1.5–1.7 still hold for $a_{ll}(l = 1, 2)$ defined by (3.52). The proof is quite similar and the only thing which needs to be shown is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_1 \right) \cdot V_1 \\ &= - \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_1 \partial_{x_j} V_1 - \int_{\partial D_1} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_1 \nu_j \cdot 1 \\ &= - \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_1 \partial_{x_j} V_1 - a_{11}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.

$$a_{11} = - \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} V_1 \partial_{x_j} V_1.$$

Then by the uniform ellipticity of $a_2^{ij}(x)$ and the harmonicity of v_1 ,

$$|a_{11}| \geq \lambda \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla V_1|^2 \geq \lambda \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla v_1|^2,$$

and

$$|a_{11}| \leq \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} w \partial_{x_j} w \leq \Lambda \int_{\tilde{\Omega}} |\nabla w|^2 \leq \Lambda \int_{\tilde{\Omega} \cap O_{r/2}} |\nabla \bar{w}|^2 + C,$$

where w is defined in the proof of Lemma 1.5 with the same boundary data of V_1 and $\bar{w}$ is defined by (1.26) and (1.31).

Thus, Lemma 1.5–1.7 follow by the same computations. Then Lemma 1.8 and Proposition 1.2 hold with the same proofs.

For $|b_1 - \alpha b_2|$, Proposition 1.3 also holds for $b_l (l = 1, 2)$ defined by (3.52) and $Q_\varepsilon[\varphi]$ defined by (0.17). The proof is the same after changing $\frac{\partial^*}{\partial \nu}$ to $a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i}^* \nu_j$.

Combining the above propositions, we obtain our theorems.

4 Appendix

Some elementary results for the conductivity problem

Assume that in $\mathbb{R}^n$, Ω and ω are bounded open sets with $C^{2,\alpha}$ boundaries, $0 < \alpha < 1$, satisfying

$$\bar{\omega} = \bigcup_{s=1}^m \bar{\omega}_s \subset \Omega,$$

where $\{\omega_s\}$ are connected components of ω . Clearly, $m < \infty$ and ω_s is open for all $1 \leq s \leq m$. Given $\varphi \in C^2(\partial\Omega)$, the conductivity problem we consider is the following transmission problem with Dirichlet boundary condition:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{x_j} \left\{ \left[(k a_1^{ij}(x) - a_2^{ij}(x)) \chi_\omega + a_2^{ij}(x) \right] \partial_{x_i} u_k \right\} = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_k = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \quad (4.54)$$

where $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, and χ_ω is the characteristic function of ω .

The $n \times n$ matrixes $A_1(x) := (a_1^{ij}(x))$ in ω , $A_2(x) := (a_2^{ij}(x))$ in $\Omega \setminus \bar{\omega}$ are symmetric and $\exists$ a constant $\Lambda \geq \lambda > 0$ such that

$$\lambda |\xi|^2 \leq a_1^{ij}(x) \xi_i \xi_j \leq \Lambda |\xi|^2 \quad (\forall x \in \omega), \quad \lambda |\xi|^2 \leq a_2^{ij}(x) \xi_i \xi_j \leq \Lambda |\xi|^2 \quad (\forall x \in \Omega \setminus \omega)$$

for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $a_1^{ij}(x) \in C^2(\overline{\omega})$, $a_2^{ij}(x) \in C^2(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \omega)$.

Equation (4.54) can be rewritten in the following form to emphasize the transmission condition on $\partial\omega$:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_1^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \right) = 0 & \text{in } \omega, \\ \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \right) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}, \\ u_k|_+ = u_k|_-, & \text{on } \partial\omega, \\ a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \nu_j|_+ = k a_1^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \nu_j|_- & \text{on } \partial\omega, \\ u_k = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.55)$$

Here and throughout this paper ν is the outward unit normal and the subscript $\pm$ indicates the limit from outside and inside the domain, respectively.

We list the following results which are well known and omit the proofs.

Theorem 4.1 *If $u_k \in H^1(\Omega)$ is a solution of equation (4.54), then $u_k \in C^1(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \omega) \cap C^1(\overline{\omega})$ and satisfies equation (4.55).*

If $u_k \in C^1(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \omega) \cap C^1(\overline{\omega})$ is a solution of equation (4.55), then $u_k \in H^1(\Omega)$ and satisfies equation (4.54).

Theorem 4.2 *There exists at most one solution $u_k \in H^1(\Omega)$ to equation (4.54).*

The existence of the solution can be obtained by using the variational method. For every k , we define the energy functional

$$I_k[v] := \frac{k}{2} \int_{\omega} a_1^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} v \partial_{x_j} v + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} v \partial_{x_j} v, \quad (4.56)$$

where v belongs to the set

$$H_{\varphi}^1(\Omega) := \{v \in H^1(\Omega) \mid v = \varphi \text{ on } \partial\Omega\}.$$

Theorem 4.3 *For every k , there exists a minimizer $u_k \in H^1(\Omega)$ satisfying*

$$I_k[u_k] = \min_{v \in H_{\varphi}^1(\Omega)} I_k[v].$$

Moreover, $u_k \in H^1(\Omega)$ is a solution of equation (4.54).

Comparing equation (4.55), when $k = +\infty$, the perfectly conducting problem turns out to be:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \right) = 0 & \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}, \\ u|_+ = u|_- & \text{on } \partial\omega, \\ \nabla u = 0 & \text{in } \omega, \\ \int_{\partial\omega_s} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \nu_j|_+ = 0 & (s = 1, 2, \dots, m), \\ u = \varphi & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \quad (4.57)$$

We also have similar results:

Theorem 4.4 *If $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ satisfies equation (4.57) except for the fourth line, then $u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega \setminus \omega}) \cap C^1(\overline{\omega})$.*

Proof: By the third line of equation (4.57), we have $u \equiv \text{const}$ on each component of ω , so $u \equiv \text{const}$ on each component of $\partial\omega$. Thus $u \equiv \text{const}$ on each component of $\partial(\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega})$.

Since $u \in H^1(\Omega)$ satisfies $\partial_{x_i} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \right) = 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}$, $u|_{\partial\Omega} = \varphi \in C^2(\partial\Omega)$ and $u \equiv \text{const}$ on each component of $\partial(\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega})$, by the elliptic regularity theory, we have $u \in C^1(\overline{\Omega \setminus \omega}) \cap C^1(\overline{\omega})$. $\square$

Theorem 4.5 *There exists at most one solution $u \in H^1(\Omega) \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega \setminus \omega}) \cap C^1(\overline{\omega})$ of equation (4.57).*

Proof: It is equivalent to showing that if $\varphi = 0$, equation (4.57) only has the solution $u \equiv 0$. Integrating by parts in the first line of equation (4.57), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= - \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \right) \cdot u \\ &= \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \partial_{x_j} u - \int_{\partial\Omega} u \cdot a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \nu_j|_- + \int_{\partial\omega} u \cdot a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \nu_j|_+ \\ &\geq \lambda \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} |\nabla u|^2 - \int_{\partial\Omega} \varphi \cdot a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \nu_j|_- + C_s \int_{\partial\omega_s} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \nu_j|_+ \\ &= \lambda \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} |\nabla u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\nabla u = 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}$. And since $u = \varphi = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we have $u \equiv 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}$. Since $u|_+ = u|_-$ on $\partial\omega$ and $u \equiv C$ on $\overline{\omega}$, we get $u = 0$ on $\overline{\omega}$. Hence $u \equiv 0$ in Ω , i.e. $u \equiv 0$ is the only solution of (4.57) when $\varphi = 0$. $\square$

Define the energy functional

$$I_\infty[v] := \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} v \partial_{x_j} v, \quad (4.58)$$

where v belongs to the set

$$\mathcal{A} := \{v \in H_\varphi^1(\Omega) \mid \nabla v \equiv 0 \text{ in } \omega\}.$$

Theorem 4.6 *There exists a minimizer $u \in \mathcal{A}$ satisfying*

$$I_\infty[u] = \min_{v \in \mathcal{A}} I_\infty[v].$$

Moreover, $u \in H^1(\Omega) \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega \setminus \omega}) \cap C^1(\overline{\omega})$ is a solution of equation (4.57).

Proof: By the lower-semi continuity of I_∞ and the weakly closed property of $\mathcal{A}$, it is easy to see that the minimizer $u \in \mathcal{A}$ exists and satisfies $\partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \right) = 0$ in $\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}$. The only thing which needs to be shown is the fourth line in equation (4.57), i.e.

$$\int_{\partial\omega_s} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \nu_j|_+ = 0, \quad s = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

In fact, since u is a minimizer, for any $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ satisfying $\phi \equiv 1$ on $\overline{\omega}_s$ and $\phi \equiv 0$ on $\overline{\omega}_t (t \neq s)$, let

$$i(t) := I_\infty[u + t\phi] \quad (t \in \mathbb{R}),$$

we have

$$i'(0) := \frac{di}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} = \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \phi_{x_j} = 0.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= - \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \right) \phi = \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \phi_{x_j} + \int_{\partial\omega_s} \phi \cdot a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \nu_j|_+ \\ &= \int_{\partial\omega_s} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \nu_j|_+, \end{aligned}$$

for all $s = 1, 2, \dots, m$. □

Finally, we give the relationship between u_k and u .

Theorem 4.7 *Let u_k and u in $H^1(\Omega)$ be the solutions of equations (4.55) and (4.57), respectively. Then*

$$u_k \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{in } H^1(\Omega), \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow +\infty,$$

and

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} I_k[u_k] = I_\infty[u],$$

where I_k and I_∞ are defined as (4.56) and (4.58).

Proof: Step 1. By the uniqueness of the solution to equation (4.57), we only need to show that there exists a weak limit u of a subsequence of $\{u_k\}$ in $H^1(\Omega)$ and u is the solution of equation (4.57).

(1) To show that after passing to a subsequence, u_k weakly converges in $H^1(\Omega)$ to some u .

Let $\eta \in H_\varphi^1(\Omega)$ be fixed and satisfy $\eta \equiv 0$ on $\overline{\omega}$, then since u_k is the minimizer of I_k in $H_\varphi^1(\Omega)$, we have

$$\frac{\lambda}{2} \|\nabla u_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \leq I_k[u_k] \leq I_k[\eta] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \eta_{x_i} \eta_{x_j} \leq \frac{\Lambda}{2} \|\eta\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2,$$

i.e.

$$\|\nabla u_k\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq \|\eta\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \doteq \overline{M},$$

where $\overline{M}$ is independent of k .

Since $u_k = \varphi$ on $\partial\Omega$ and $\sup_k \|u_k\|_{H^1(\Omega)} < \infty$, we have $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ in $H^1_\varphi(\Omega)$.

(2) To show that u is a solution of equation (4.57).

In fact, we only need to prove the following three conditions:

$$\partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}, \quad (4.59)$$

$$\nabla u = 0 \quad \text{in } \omega, \quad (4.60)$$

$$\int_{\partial\omega_s} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \nu_j|_+ = 0, \quad s = 1, 2, \dots, m. \quad (4.61)$$

(i) For every k , since $u_k \in H^1(\Omega)$ is the solution of equation (4.54), then $\forall \phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$, we have

$$k \int_{\omega} a_1^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \phi_{x_j} + \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \phi_{x_j} = 0.$$

Thus, $\forall \phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}) \subset C_c^\infty(\Omega)$,

$$0 = \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \phi_{x_j} \longrightarrow \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \phi_{x_j},$$

since $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ in $H^1_\varphi(\Omega) \subset H^1(\Omega)$.

Therefore,

$$\int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \phi_{x_j} = 0, \quad \forall \phi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}),$$

i.e. (4.59).

(ii) Let $\eta \in H^1_\varphi(\Omega)$ be fixed and satisfy $\eta \equiv 0$ on $\overline{\omega}$, then since u_k is the minimizer of I_k in $H^1_\varphi(\Omega)$, we have

$$\frac{k\lambda}{2} \|\nabla u_k\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \leq I_k[u_k] \leq I_k[\eta] = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} \eta \partial_{x_j} \eta \leq \frac{\Lambda}{2} \|\eta\|_{H^1(\Omega)}^2,$$

which implies

$$\|\nabla u_k\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \rightarrow \infty.$$

By (1), since $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ in $H^1(\Omega)$, then $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ in $H^1(\omega)$. Therefore, by the lower-semi continuity, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \lambda \int_{\omega} |\nabla u|^2 &\leq \int_{\omega} a_1^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \partial_{x_j} u \leq \int_{\omega} a_1^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \partial_{x_j} u_k \\ &\leq \Lambda \|\nabla u_k\|_{L^2(\omega)}^2 \longrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } k \longrightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\int_{\omega} |\nabla u|^2 = 0 \implies \nabla u \equiv 0$ in ω , which is just (4.60).

(iii) By (i) and (ii), u satisfies (4.59) and is either constant or φ on each component

of $\partial(\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega})$. Thus, $u \in C^2(\overline{\Omega \setminus \omega})$. For each $s = 1, 2, \dots, m$, we construct a function $\varrho \in C^2(\overline{\Omega \setminus \omega})$, such that $\varrho = 1$ on $\partial\omega_s$, $\varrho = 0$ on $\partial\omega_t$ ($t \neq s$), and $\varrho = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. By Green's Identity, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= - \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \right) \varrho \\
&= \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \partial_{x_j} \varrho - \int_{\partial\Omega} \varrho \cdot a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \nu_j|_- + \int_{\partial\omega} \varrho \cdot a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \nu_j|_+ \\
&= \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \partial_{x_j} \varrho + k \int_{\partial\omega_s} a_1^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \nu_j|_- \\
&= \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \partial_{x_j} \varrho.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$0 = - \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} \partial_{x_j} \left(a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \right) \varrho = \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \partial_{x_j} \varrho + \int_{\partial\omega_s} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \nu_j|_+.$$

Since $u_k \rightharpoonup u$ in $H^1(\Omega)$, it follows

$$0 = \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \partial_{x_j} \varrho \longrightarrow \int_{\Omega \setminus \overline{\omega}} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \partial_{x_j} \varrho.$$

Thus,

$$\int_{\partial\omega_s} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \nu_j|_+ = 0,$$

for any $s = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Therefore, we finish the proof of the first part.

Step 2. Since u_k is a minimizer of I_k and $\nabla u = 0$ in ω , for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$I_k[u_k] \leq I_k[u] = I_\infty[u].$$

Then $\limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} I_k[u_k] \leq I_\infty[u]$.

On the other hand, by Theorem 4.7, since u is the weak limit of $\{u_k\}$ in $H^1(\Omega)$, we obtain

$$I_\infty[u] = \int_{\Omega} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u \partial_{x_j} u \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{\Omega} a_2^{ij}(x) \partial_{x_i} u_k \partial_{x_j} u_k \leq \liminf_{k \rightarrow +\infty} I_k[u_k].$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} I_k[u_k] = I_\infty[u].$$

□

References

- [1] H. Ammari, G. Dassios, H. Kang and M. Lim, Estimates for the electric field in the presence of adjacent perfectly conducting spheres, *Quat. J. Appl. Math.*, to appear.
- [2] H. Ammari, H. Kang, H. Lee, J. Lee and M. Lim, Optimal bounds on the gradient of the solutions to conductivity problems, preprint.
- [3] H. Ammari, H. Kang and M. Lim, Gradient estimates to the conductivity problem, *Math. Ann.* 322 (2005), 277-286.
- [4] I. Babuska, B. Anderson, P.J. Smith, and K. Levin, Damage analysis of fiber composites. I. Statistical analysis on fiber scale, *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.* 172 (1999), 27-77.
- [5] E. Bonnetier and M. Vogelius, An elliptic regularity result for a composite medium with "touching" fibers of circular cross-section, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 31 (2000), 651-677.
- [6] B. Budiansky and G.F. Carrier, High shear stresses in stiff fiber composites, *J. App. Mech.* 51 (1984), 733-735.
- [7] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, Reprint of the 1998 edition, *Classics in Mathematics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [8] Y.Y. Li and L. Nirenberg, Estimates for elliptic system from composite material, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 56 (2003), 892-925.
- [9] Y.Y. Li and M. Vogelius, Gradient estimates for solution to divergence form elliptic equation with discontinuous coefficients, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 153 (2000), 91-151.
- [10] X. Markenscoff, Stress amplification in vanishingly small geometries, *Computational Mechanics* 19 (1996), 77-83.
- [11] K. Yun, Estimates for electric fields blown up between closely adjacent conductors with arbitrary shape, *SIAM J. on Applied Math.*, to appear.
- [12] K. Yun, Optimal bound on high stresses occurring between stiff fibers with arbitrary shaped cross-sections, preprint.